

REMARKS

The present Amendment and Request For Continued Examination, presents a substantial effort toward placing the application in condition for allowance. Claims are amended and additional claims added.

All the claims in the application were rejected in the last Office Action of June 14, 2006.

The Examiner has stated in the previous Action that Applicant did not mention or claim a feature for calibrating the instrument. The instrument is calibrated by the addition and use of a standard, as indicated in the specification and claims. The purpose and result of a sorptive tube and the dual pathway according to the present invention, is the creation of a blank.

The Examiner has commented that Applicant "only claims a calibration assembly to add a standard of predetermined concentration of analyte to a sample". The Examiner thus has not appreciated that the standard must be added, this being a solution with no analyte.

As stated at the 6th and 7th sentences on page 5 of the Office Action, although activated carbon would remove some particles, this is not at all the reason for use with the present invention. Applicant urges that if Morton utilized activated carbon in his filter, there would be no trichloroethene for analysis, irrespective of how the rest of the Morton instrumentation may be assembled.

The Examiner commented at pages 5-6 of the Action, that Applicant incorrectly interpreted the flow of Morton. Applicant does not dispute that there is no alternate path around the sample pretreatment module 30 of Morton. The Examiner refers to two sample sources, ground water 20a or industrial water 20b, which can be pumped through water filter 90. This is a non sequitur in that filter 90 is located in a different position from the sample pretreatment module 30. However, every filter 90 does not have an alternate flow path around the filter.

A primary feature of the cited Morton reference, as stated therein, is that there are "two potential sources of samples" 20a and 20b. There is no flow path around the filter 90 of the reference, in contrast with Applicant's arrangement.

Independent Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to specify instrument calibration means, and Claim 10 has been amended to specify calibration of the instrument. These claims are urged to be allowable.

New Claims 18-22 are presented by the present Amendment. These claims relate to a method of calibrating an analytical sensor using sample water for the creation of standards of known concentration.

Claims 19-22 depend respectively from Claim 18. Dependent Claim 19 specifies a three way valve for dividing the first flow path. Dependent Claim 20 specifies multiple volumes of a standard injected into the second flow path to create known concentrations of calibration standard. Dependent Claim 21 specifies a calibrated loop to measure the volume of analytical chemical into a second flow path. Dependent Claim 22 specifies activated carbon or other sorptive media used in a canister in the second flow path.


Applicant respectfully urges that Claims 18-22 define specific novel methods for calibrating an analytical sensor. These claims are urged to define novel combinations, and are respectfully urged to be allowable.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims amendments and new claims clearly define novel and patentable combinations. Allowance of the present claims is respectfully urged.

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SCOTT R. BURGE

BY   
Boniard I. Brown  
Regis. #17940  
Attorney for Applicant

1710 W. Cameron Ave.  
Suite 200  
W. Covina, CA. 91790

TELE: 626-338-0100